

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,691,070 by Williams, *et al* (hereafter "Williams") in view of US 6,405,111 by Rogers, *et al* (hereafter "Rogers"). Applicant traverses this rejection.

In making this rejection, the Examiner maintains that Williams teaches all of the limitations of Figure 3 except the limitation referring to the controller communicating data to the server via HTTP. The Examiner looks to Rogers as providing the missing teaching. With respect to the teachings in Williams, the Examiner looks to the discussion of Figure 3 in Williams and parts of the discussions of the prior art shown in Figure 1 and the embodiment of Williams shown in Figure 2. None of these embodiments teach a controller that generates data based on the measurements of the received signals and communicates that data to a server via the computer network. The only server described in the cited passages is processor 42 shown in Figure 2. In Figure 3, Williams makes it clear that processor 42 is a server.

Referring to Figure 2 in Williams, the only candidate for the interface for receiving signals from a sensor is interface adapter 20 shown in Figure 2. This adapter connects the signals to processor 42, which in turn is connected to network 44. Hence, to match this embodiment to Claim 3, processor 42 must be the interface for connecting the collection node to a computer network and the controller for generating data based on the measurement of the received signals and communicating that data via a computer network. But Williams does not teach that processor 42 communicates the collected data to a server on the network via the network. Hence, there is no candidate for the "server" that receives the data via the network. Accordingly, the Examiner has not shown that each element of Claim 3 is taught in the references, and hence, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case for obviousness with respect to Claim 3 and the claims dependent therefrom.

The Examiner rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of US 6,920,495 by Fuselier, *et al* (hereafter "Fuselier"). Applicant traverses this rejection.

The Examiner maintains that Williams teaches all of the limitations of Claim 5 except for the limitation that the controller communicates with the server via a proxy server. The Examiner looks to Fuselier for the missing teaching that one can use a proxy server.

As pointed out above, Williams does not teach that the data collection node communicates the data to a server via the computer network. Hence, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case for obviousness with respect to Claim 5.

The Examiner rejected Claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of US 6,085,243 by Fletcher, *et al* (hereafter "Fletcher"). Applicant traverses this rejection.

The Examiner maintains that Williams teaches all of the limitations of Claim 6 with the exception of the limitation that the collection node includes a clock that generates time readings that are included in the data communicated to the server. The Examiner looks to Fletcher for the missing teaching.

As pointed out above, Williams does not teach that the data collection node communicates the data to a server via the computer network. Hence, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* for Claim 6, and the claims dependent therefrom.

The Examiner rejected Claims 8-11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of US 6,490,617 by Hemphill, *et al* (hereafter "Hemphill"). Applicant traverses this rejection.

With respect to Claim 8, the Examiner maintains that Williams teaches all of the limitations of Claim 8 except for the limitation that the server receives a registration message from the controller. The Examiner looks to Hemphill as teaching a data collection node that sends a registration message to a server that causes information from the node to then be available through a web page.

First, as pointed out above, Williams does not teach that the collection node communicates with a server on the network, no less that it communicates data to that server. The data collection node taught in Williams is the server.

Second, the references cited by the Examiner with respect to the creation of web pages for accessing data in the server in the node do not teach that the web pages are setup in response to any form of registration message or any message from a device external to that node. Williams teaches that the web pages are part of the preprogrammed server applications on the node.

Hemphill teaches a system in which devices that are to be managed by a server send a registration message to that server. However, such a system would not be needed in the system taught in Williams, since the server in Williams is directly connected to the devices being managed by the server, and hence, has no need to receive registration messages from those devices over the network. Hence, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case for obviousness with respect to Claim 8, or the claims dependent therefrom.

The Examiner rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Hemphill as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Fuselier. Applicant traverses this rejection.

The Examiner maintains that Williams in view of Hemphill teaches all of the limitations of Claim 12 with the exception of the controller communicating with the server via a proxy server on the computer network. The Examiner looks to Fuselier as providing the missing teaching.

As pointed out above, the combination of Williams and Hemphill does not teach the limitations of Claim 12. The Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in Fueslier that provides the missing teachings, and hence, Applicant submits that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case for obviousness with respect to Claim 12.


The Examiner rejected Claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Hemphill as applied to Claim 8 above, and further in view of Fletcher. Applicant traverses this rejection.

The Examiner maintains that Williams in view of Hemphill teaches all of the limitations of Claim 8, but does not explicitly disclose a clock for generating time readings that are included with data that is communicated to said server. The Examiner looks to Fletcher for the missing teaching.

As pointed out above, the combination of Williams and Hemphill does not teach all of the limitations of Claim 8. The Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in Fletcher that provides the missing teachings, and hence, Applicant submits that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case for obviousness with respect to Claim 13, or Claim 14, which depends therefrom.

I hereby certify that this paper is being sent by FAX to 517-273-8300.

Respectfully Submitted,



Calvin B. Ward
Registration No. 30,896
Date: Nov. 29, 2005

Agilent Technologies, Inc.
Legal Department, M/S DL429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599 Loveland, CO 80537-0599
Telephone (925) 855-0413
Telefax (925) 855-9214